

Application No.: 10/554,401
Response to OA dated June 10, 2008

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present patent application are respectfully requested in view of the following amendments and remarks. Upon entry of the present Reply, Claims 1 through 7 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 have been amended. Applicant submits that upon entry of the present Reply, claims 1-7 are in condition for allowance. Moreover, the Applicants submit that no new matter has been introduced by the foregoing amendments.

Prior Art

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his indication that none of the references appear to show the claimed details with regard to the communication control and address control. Further, upon submission of the present amendment, the Applicants submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Specifically, the Office Action states that the disclosure of the presently pending application provides not support for a “configuring operation.” Pursuant to this, claim 1 has been amended to remove the configuring operation and recite, “a communication control unit controls communication,” and “an address control unit controls address,” respectively. Support for these amendments may be found in paragraphs [0041] through [0042] and the Applicants

Application No.: 10/554,401
Response to OA dated June 10, 2008

submit that no new matter has been added by way of these amendments. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, the Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Similarly, claim 2 has been amended to remove the configuring operation. Claim 2 now recites, “a driving system setting unit that initializes the attribute area...” Support for this amendment may be found in paragraphs [0019], [0048] and [0066] and applicants submit that no new matter has been added by way of these amendments. Also, claims 3 and 4 do not recite any configuring operation. Accordingly, for at least the reasons state above, the Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejections of dependent claims 2-4 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Applicants respectfully traverse each of these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 was rejected for reciting the allegedly indefinite language of “configured to” as well as lacking positive antecedent basis for the “the initial address.” As stated above, claim 1 has been amended and no longer recites “configured to” language. Further, claim 1 has been amended to recite “an initial address” in order to properly recite the antecedent basis of that subject matter. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, the Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections of independent claim 1 be withdrawn as well as the rejection of claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1 and not otherwise rejected.

Application No.: 10/554,401
Response to OA dated June 10, 2008

Similar to the above, claim 2 was rejected for containing the allegedly indefinite language of “configured to”. Additionally, claim 2 was rejected because the term “the driving system” is allegedly unclear and lacks positive antecedent basis. As stated above, claim 2 has been amended and no longer recites the “configured to” language. Additionally, claim 2 has been amended to recite “a driving system,” in line 4 of the claim. Support for this amendment and description regarding the driving system may be found, for example, in paragraph [0046] and paragraph [0049], lines 15-29 and the Applicants submit that no new matter is added by way of this amendment. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, the Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections of claim 2 be withdrawn.

Claim 4 was rejected because it was not clear what is meant by “a PHS communication capability.” Claim 4 has been amended and now recites, “said additional card is provided with a portable telephone communication capability.” Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0030] and [0038]. The Applicants submit that no new matter is added by way of this amendment. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, the Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

Claim 5 was rejected because of a lack of antecedent basis for the term “the initial address.” Claim 5 has been amended and now recites “an initial address” in order to properly recite the antecedent basis of that subject matter. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, the Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of independent claim 5 be withdrawn as well as the rejection of claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1 and not otherwise rejected.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Application No.: 10/554,401
Response to OA dated June 10, 2008

SEP 10 2008

Claim 6 was rejected because the term "the driving system" is allegedly unclear and lacks positive antecedent basis. Claim 6 has been amended to recite "a driving system," in line 4 of the claim. Support for this amendment and description regarding the driving system may be found, for example, in paragraph [0046] and paragraph [0049], lines 15-29 and the Applicants submit that no new matter is added by way of this amendment. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated above, the Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections of claim 6 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, at the telephone number listed below.

Very truly yours,
MAIER & MAIER, PLLC



Christopher J. Maier
Registration No. 53,255

Date: September 10, 2008
MAIER & MAIER, PLLC
1000 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314
(703) 740-8322